



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/966,522	09/28/2001	Thomas Krahn	100717-502 / Bayer 10139	5606
27384	7590	11/19/2010		
Briscoe, Kurt G. Norris McLaughlin & Marcus, PA 875 Third Avenue, 8th Floor New York, NY 10022				
EXAMINER				
DO, PENSEE T				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1641				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
11/19/2010		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/966,522

Applicant(s)

KRAHN ET AL.

Examiner

Pensee T. Do

Art Unit

1641

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 May 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 7-17 and 19-44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 7-17 and 25-43 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 19-24 and 44 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 7-17, 19-44 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/ISA/C3)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

This application 09966522, filed 09/28/2001 and having 2 RCE-type filings therein is a continuation of 09194099, filed 11/20/1998 ,now U.S. Patent #6420183 and having 2 RCE-type filings therein. Application 09194099 is a national stage entry of PCT/EP97/02662 , International Filing Date: 05/23/1997 and claims foreign priority to 19621312.6 , filed 05/28/1996.

The effective filing date is 5/28/1996.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on May 24, 2010 has been entered.

Amendment Entry & Claims Status

The amendment filed on May 24, 2010 has been acknowledged and entered.

Claims 7-17, 19-44 are pending.

Claims 7-17, 25-43 are withdrawn from further consideration.

Claims 19-24 and 44 are being examined.

Withdrawn Rejection(s)

All rejections under 103(a) in the previous office action are withdrawn herein.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 19-22 and 44 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-21 of U.S. Patent No. 7,063,952 ('952). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because patent '952 teaches a composition comprising: a fluorescent dye and a masking dye which reduces non-specific background light emitted from the solution.

Patent '952 fails to teach that the masking dye reduces non-specific background light by at least 10%, 30%, 50% and 70%.

Regarding claims 19-22, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the present invention to use specific amounts of the masking dye to reduce non-specific background light emitted from said solution by at least 10%, 30%, 50% or 70%, since it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. In re Boesch, 617 F.2d 272,205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).

Claims 23 and 24 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-21 of U.S. Patent No. 7,063,952 in view of Van Aken (US 5,489,537).

Patent '952 teaches a composition comprising: a fluorescent dye and a masking dye which reduces non-specific background light emitted from the solution.

However, patent '952 fails to teach that the masking dye is Brilliant Black and said masking dye improves optical signal-to-noise-ratio by at least 300%.

Van Aken teaches a method and kit for determining the presence or absence of a substance by detection of a colloidal dye associated with agglutinated particles. The colloidal dye is a background-enhancing dye, which reduces non-specific background to enhance optical detection. The background-enhancing dye is a water-soluble dye such as Brilliant Black. (see col. 21, lines 58-67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art to use Brilliant Black as a masking or quenching dye in the kit in the patent '952 because these references teach using quenching or background reducing dye, which reduces background light in assay. Since Brilliant Black is known for enhancing the background in an assay, which uses optical detection, it would motivate one of ordinary skills in the art to use Brilliant Black as a masking dye in patent '952 since patent '952 uses a fluorescence dye which has potential non-specific light emitting background.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, see response , filed May 24, 2010, with respect to claims 19-24 and 44 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejection of 103(a) has been withdrawn.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Pensee T. Do whose telephone number is 571-272-0819. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Shibuya can be reached on 571-272-0806. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Pensee T. Do/
Examiner, Art Unit 1641
/Jacob Cheu/
Examiner, Art Unit 1641